

# VU Research Portal

## Equally moved and not really sick from viewing 2D and 3D motion stimuli on a TV screen

Lubeck, Astrid J.A.; Bos, Jelte E.; Stins, John F.

### ***published in***

Displays

2016

### ***DOI (link to publisher)***

[10.1016/j.displa.2015.10.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.displa.2015.10.004)

### ***document version***

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

### ***citation for published version (APA)***

Lubeck, A. J. A., Bos, J. E., & Stins, J. F. (2016). Equally moved and not really sick from viewing 2D and 3D motion stimuli on a TV screen. *Displays*, 41, 9-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.displa.2015.10.004>

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

### **E-mail address:**

[vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl](mailto:vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl)



# Equally moved and not really sick from viewing 2D and 3D motion stimuli on a TV screen



Astrid J.A. Lubeck<sup>a,\*</sup>, Jelte E. Bos<sup>a,b</sup>, John F. Stins<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Research Institute MOVE, Department of Human Movement Sciences, VU University Amsterdam, Netherlands

<sup>b</sup> TNO Perceptual and Cognitive Systems, Soesterberg, Netherlands

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 10 June 2015

Received in revised form 22 September 2015

Accepted 11 October 2015

Available online 22 October 2015

### Keywords:

Visually induced motion sickness

Stereoscopic 3D

Postural control

Field of view

Quarantining

## ABSTRACT

**Objective:** Visually induced motion sickness (VIMS) and increased postural sway are two adverse side effects that may occur when viewing motion stimuli. However, whether these effects are elevated to a greater extent when viewing stereoscopic 3D motion stimuli, compared to 2D stimuli on a TV screen, has not been investigated under controlled circumstances. Therefore this study aimed at investigating VIMS and postural sway before, during, and directly after viewing 2D and 3D motion stimuli, on a commonly available TV screen.

**Method:** 16 Participants were exposed to an aviation documentary shown in 2D and in 3D on separate occasions. Before, during, and after exposure, VIMS and postural sway were measured. VIMS was quantified by a rating scale giving a single number, and by a multi-symptom questionnaire that assessed multiple VIMS symptoms separately. Sway path length, standard deviations and short-range and long-range scaling components of the center of pressure were calculated as measures of postural sway.

**Results:** VIMS symptom severity, as obtained with the single rating scale, did not show a significant increase to either 2D or 3D exposure. The multi-symptom questionnaire did reveal significant increases in VIMS symptom severity to both 2D and 3D exposure. However, VIMS was not significantly more increased in case of 3D exposure compared to 2D exposure. All postural sway measures (sway path length, standard deviation in mediolateral and anteroposterior direction, as well as the short-range scaling components) increased significantly as a result of exposure. None of the postural sway measures was differentially affected to 3D as compared to 2D exposure.

**Conclusion:** Viewing 3D motion stimuli did not cause more serious VIMS symptoms, compared to viewing motion stimuli in 2D. We attribute this lack of difference to the fact that the 3D effects in this documentary were optimized for viewing in a cinema, the projection on the TV-screen thus causing quarantining of the visual input. The increase in postural sway, irrespective of image type, may reflect exploratory behavior, allowing the participant to gain more information about self-orientation with respect to the virtual environment.

© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Nowadays, thanks to spectacular technological improvements, 3D stereoscopic technology is implemented on a regular basis, and has entered the living room with the introduction of commercially available 3D TVs. However, with these developments the concern over possible adverse effects due to prolonged exposure to 3D motion stimuli has increased. This study aims at jointly investigating two possible adverse effects of viewing 3D, compared to viewing 2D, on a common TV screen.

Exposure to motion stimuli, either in 2D or 3D, can cause symptoms similar to those associated with motion sickness, also called visually induced motion sickness (VIMS) [1–6]. VIMS is a condition in which viewers experience oculomotor, disorienting and especially nauseating symptoms due to exposure to certain visual patterns, while being physically stationary [1–4]. In addition to VIMS symptoms, viewing motion stimuli can also affect postural control, defined as “the act of maintaining, achieving or restoring a state of balance during any posture or activity” [7]. In particular it has been shown that postural sway increases due to viewing 2D [8–11] and 3D motion stimuli [12].

An influential theory explaining the origin of VIMS is the sensory conflict theory [13–15]. According to this theory, VIMS symptoms arise when there is a mismatch between sensory signals from

\* Corresponding author at: Vrije Universiteit (VU), Faculty of Behavioural and Movement Sciences, De Boelelaan 1091, 1081 HV Amsterdam, Netherlands.

E-mail address: [astrid.lubeck@vu.nl](mailto:astrid.lubeck@vu.nl) (A.J.A. Lubeck).

the visual, vestibular and somatosensory senses and the expected sensory signals [13–15]. In daily life the signals from these senses correspond with each other, and are also congruent with the expected sensory signals based on an internal model. However, when viewing 2D or 3D motion stimuli whilst sitting or standing still, the visual cues do not coincide with the vestibular cues and are also not in line with the expected sensory signals. This conflict between the sensory signals and expected sensory signals is proposed to cause VIMS. It has been suggested already that especially visual motion indicating a change in the Earth-vertical is necessary to cause VIMS [15–17]. Next to such visual motion, in this paper we propose that viewing 3D motion stimuli exacerbates VIMS compared to viewing visual motion stimuli in 2D.

3D motion stimuli contain, compared to 2D motion stimuli, stereoscopic information which is proposed to be the additional provocative factor with respect to VIMS symptoms (see e.g. [18–20]). The stereoscopic information is known to add to the naturalness of the 3D motion stimuli [21,22]. Because 3D motion stimuli appear more natural, a larger conflict between the sensed and expected sensory signals is suggested (see also [23]), therefore causing more severe VIMS symptoms as compared to 2D. Several earlier studies have investigated the effect of viewing stereoscopic 3D stimuli, compared to viewing 2D stimuli. In these studies participants were exposed to computer generated stimuli or a movie, that was shown in 2D and 3D on either a projection screen, at the cinema or on a TV-screen [2,24–27]. Despite the large differences in stimuli and displaying techniques, in all studies participants experienced significantly more severe VIMS symptoms after viewing 3D motion stimuli compared to 2D motion stimuli [2,24–27].

VIMS and postural sway have been jointly studied, mainly using 2D stimuli. The majority of these studies reported a significant rise in VIMS symptoms as well as increased postural sway (e.g. [8–11]). To the best of our knowledge only Bos et al. [12] studied VIMS and postural sway characteristics prior to, and after viewing 3D motion stimuli. They found that, after viewing a 3D documentary in a cinema, VIMS and postural sway were significantly increased compared to before viewing. Unfortunately, Bos et al. [12] were not able to make a comparison with 2D presentation, impeding a direct comparison of potential adverse effects of 3D viewing to 2D viewing on both VIMS and postural sway.

In summary, exposure to both 2D and 3D motion stimuli are able to cause VIMS symptoms and increase postural sway. However, an experiment comparing VIMS, as well as postural sway induced by viewing 2D and 3D motion stimuli is still lacking. To address this gap in the literature, in this paper we investigate subjective reports of VIMS symptoms and postural sway in one group of participants, who are exposed to the same motion stimuli shown in 2D and 3D on a commonly available TV-screen. Based on the existing literature, we hypothesize that prolonged exposure to both 2D and 3D motion stimuli will increase symptoms of VIMS, and we predict 3D to cause more VIMS related symptoms in comparison to 2D exposure. We also expect postural sway to significantly increase when viewing both 2D and 3D. However, whether postural sway will also increase more when viewing 3D compared to viewing 2D remains to be seen.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Participants

Sixteen healthy young adults ( $N = 16$ ) of the Faculty of Human Movement Sciences of the VU University Amsterdam participated in this study. Participants were 5 males and 11 females with a mean age of 21.5 ( $SD = 1.32$ ) years. All participants signed an informed consent form before participation. The ethics committee

of this same faculty approved the study in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

### 2.2. Stimuli

Participants watched the aviation documentary 'Legends of Flight', with ample scene motion in all degrees of freedom, previously shown to cause VIMS in an unselected sample of cinema goers [12]. The documentary lasts 45 min, and in the current experiment it was viewed in two separate sessions, once in 2D and once in 3D, using a commonly available 55-in. TV-screen (LG 55LA8609). 3D was realized using (light-weight) passive circular polarized glasses as provided by the manufacturer. Participants were seated at a distance of 1.34 m from the screen, yielding a field of view of 48 by 28° (horizontal × vertical). To minimize the differences between sessions, we originally aimed at using the glasses also in the 2D session (possibly using equal glasses for both eyes). This, however caused a grid of thin lines to become visible, which was not present in 3D. We therefore chose to use no glasses at all in the 2D session.

### 2.3. Measurements

#### 2.3.1. Subjective misery

Three sickness measurements were included. First, the motion sickness susceptibility questionnaire (MSSQ) was filled out prior to the experiment, in order to assess a potential history of motion sickness over the lifetime. The MSSQ assesses previous occurrences of motion sickness in cars, buses, trains, aircrafts, boats, swings, roundabouts and theme park rides up to the age of 12 and for the last 12 years. The MSSQ score has a minimum of 0, implying no problems whatsoever, and a maximum of 222, implying severe problems in all above situations. The 50th percentile of a normal population corresponds to a MSSQ score of 37 [28,29].

Second, before and right after the experiment, VIMS was assessed using the simulator sickness questionnaire (SSQ) [3]. With the SSQ, the severity of 16 sickness symptoms is rated on a 4-point scale ranging from 0 to 3 (none, slight, moderate, severe). Outcome measures of the SSQ are expressed in three subscales, representing distinct symptom clusters of simulator sickness (nausea, oculomotor and disorientation), and a total score (TS) that represents overall discomfort.

Third, misery scale (MISC) [29] rates were obtained before, during and right after the experiment. In this case, participants were asked to report their symptoms on an 11-point scale, ranging from 0 to 10. A score of 0 represents absence of symptoms, a score from 1 to 5 represents with increasing severity any symptom except nausea; a score of 6 or higher represents an increasing severity of nausea with 10 when vomiting. The MISC makes use of the observation that sickness symptoms other than nausea may vary largely between participants, and if present, generally precede nausea [29]. The advantage of the MISC over the SSQ is that it is scored using one value only, and hence can be administered within a short period of time.

#### 2.3.2. Postural sway

Postural sway was quantified by measuring excursions of the center of pressure (CoP). A custom made  $1 \times 1$  m strain gauge force plate (resolution: 0.28 N/bit) was used to collect 60 s CoP time series at 100 Hz. Participants were instructed to stand still with their arms hanging alongside their torso, head upright, and eyes closed. Feet were positioned at an angle of 30° with the heels together as depicted on the force plate.

All postural sway measures were calculated using Matlab R2014a. Onset-effects were ignored by excluding the first 5 s of each CoP time series. From these time series, a number of global,

as well as structural or fractal properties of postural sway were calculated. As global measures we calculated (1) the sway path length (SPL), defined as the length the CoP travelled over the measurement interval, and (2) standard deviations (SD) of the CoP signal in anteroposterior (AP) and mediolateral (ML) directions. Before calculation of these global measures the time series were filtered with a 2nd order low-pass Butterworth filter with a cut-off frequency of 5 Hz. As a structural or fractal measure (3), scaling components of the raw (i.e. not filtered) CoP velocity were calculated for AP and ML directions, using a detrended fluctuation analysis (DFA) [30–32]. With these scaling components insight was obtained into the serial correlation properties of the CoP time series [30]. Based on two earlier studies that found a difference between short-range and long-range scaling components [30,31], two intervals ranging from 0.3 s to 0.8 s ( $\alpha_s$ ; short range) and 3 s to 8 s ( $\alpha_l$ ; long range) were chosen. Persistent behavior of the CoP velocity is represented by a scaling component above 0.5, i.e. a positive CoP velocity at a certain moment is on average followed by more positive velocities, and vice versa. The opposite, anti-persistent behavior, is represented by a scaling component below 0.5. More information on the DFA over the CoP velocity can be found in e.g. [30,33].

#### 2.4. Procedure

Participants took, in a counterbalanced order, part in two sessions on separate days with at least one day in between sessions. In one session participants watched the aviation documentary in 2D and in the other session the same documentary in 3D. For reasons mentioned above, participants wore the polarized glasses only in the 3D session.

Preceding the first session, participants were informed about the experimental procedure, signed an informed consent, and filled out the MSSQ. At the beginning of each session participants memorized the possible MISC rates with their corresponding symptoms and practiced one CoP measurement with eyes closed. As a baseline measurement (labeled 'pre') participants filled out the SSQ, reported their current MISC rate, and a 60 s CoP measurement with eyes closed was obtained. Participants watched the entire documentary while seated, in an otherwise darkened room. The documentary was divided into three equal blocks of 15 min. After each block, the documentary was interrupted for 90 s, during which participants reported a MISC rate and a (60 s) CoP measurement with eyes closed was obtained (labeled 'per-1', 'per-2', and 'post' respectively). In other words, the measurements per-1 and per-2 were obtained in between blocks of exposure. If participants felt fairly nauseated or worse during exposure ( $\text{MISC} \geq 7$ ), the documentary was paused and participants rested for three minutes, after which it was continued until the end of the block. These preventive measures were taken in order to keep the duration of exposure and the number of measurements constant for all participants. After the entire documentary (post) the SSQ was filled out again.

#### 2.5. Data analyses

IBM SPSS Statistics 20 was used for statistical analyses. In order to study the effects of measurement moments (pre, per-1, per-2 and post) and session (2D and 3D) on sickness ratings, multiple non-parametric two-tailed Wilcoxon 2-related samples tests were conducted. For each session the SSQ-TS collected post-exposure was compared with the SSQ-TS obtained pre-exposure, resulting in one test for each session. In addition, for each measurement moment (pre and post) the two sessions (2D and 3D) were compared, resulting in another pair of tests. For each session the MISC data during (per-1 and per-2) and post-exposure were compared

to the pre-exposure measurement and for each measurement moment the two sessions (2D and 3D) were compared. A Bonferroni correction was applied to correct for the multiple comparisons.

To study the effects of measurement moment (pre, per-1, per-2 and post) and session (2D and 3D), separate  $4 \times 2$  repeated measures (RM) ANOVAs were performed on the postural sway measures. When appropriate, simple contrasts (i.e., differences with respect to the pre-exposure measurement) were used to identify where specific differences occurred. Partial eta-squared ( $\eta_p^2$ ) was calculated to determine the effect size. All variables appeared to meet the assumption of normality as checked with Kolmogorov–Smirnov tests and by visual inspection of boxplots and q–q plots.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Subjective misery

The MSSQ scores obtained prior to the experiment ranged from 0 to 152 with the 50th percentile being a MSSQ score of 31.

SSQ-TS obtained directly after exposure were significantly increased compared to before exposure,  $Z = 2.78$ ,  $p = .005$ ,  $r = .70$ , and  $Z = 2.90$ ,  $p = .004$ ,  $r = .73$  for the 2D and 3D sessions respectively (Fig. 1a). Analysis of the SSQ subscales revealed that the reported symptoms were mainly of oculomotor and disorientation origin (Fig. 1b). No differences were found between the 2D and 3D sessions for the total score and subscales. Note that the  $p$ -values were Bonferroni corrected for multiple tests ( $n = 4$ ), resulting in a significance level of .0125.

MISC rates reported in the 2D session ranged from 0 to 3 (slight symptoms), while in the 3D session they ranged from 0 to 6 (slight nausea) (Fig. 1c). Statistical testing showed that both increases were, however, not significant,  $Z = 2.04$ ,  $p = .041$  and  $Z = 2.06$ ,  $p = .039$  respectively. Note that the significance level was again Bonferroni corrected for multiple tests ( $n = 10$ ), resulting in adjusted alpha level of .005. Furthermore, the MISC rates did not significantly differ between the 2D and 3D session.


#### 3.2. Postural sway measures

##### 3.2.1. Global measures of postural sway


Time courses of the SPL and SD in AP and ML directions are shown in Figs. 2 and 3, respectively. Statistical analysis revealed significant main effects of measurement moments for both the SPL,  $F(3,45) = 3.75$ ,  $p = .017$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .20$ , and the SD in AP and in ML directions,  $F(3,45) = 3.69$ ,  $p = .018$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .20$  and  $F(3,45) = 3.78$ ,  $p = .017$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .20$  respectively. The SPL, as well as the SD in AP and ML directions, were significantly elevated during (per-1 and per-2) and after exposure as compared to the values obtained pre-exposure (Table 1). No differences were found between the 2D and 3D sessions.

##### 3.2.2. Structural measures of postural sway

Time courses of the short-range and long-range scaling components are presented in Fig. 4. Repeated measures ANOVAs showed that exposure to both 2D and 3D significantly affected the short-range scaling components,  $F(3,45) = 9.42$ ,  $p < .0001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .39$  and  $F(3,45) = 10.46$ ,  $p < .0001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .41$  for AP and ML directions, respectively. Simple contrasts revealed that the  $\alpha_s$ -AP and  $\alpha_s$ -ML increased significantly as a result of exposure to the 2D and 3D motion stimuli (Table 1). As can be observed in Fig. 4, the  $\alpha_s$ -ML shows a significant sharper increase between pre and per-1 and pre and post when exposed to 3D motion stimuli compared to exposure to 2D motion stimuli, resulting in a significant interaction ( $F(3,45) = 3.76$ ,  $p < .017$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .20$ ). The long-range scaling



**Fig. 1.** Mean scores of the two VIMS questionnaires, the simulator sickness questionnaire (SSQ) and misery scale (MISC). (a) The SSQ total scores were significantly increased directly after exposure to both 2D and 3D motion stimuli. (b) Pre-post difference scores on all subscales for the 2D and 3D session. The increase in SSQ total scores was mainly caused by increased scores on the oculomotor and disorientation subscale. (c) MISC rates did not significantly increase. No differences between the sessions were observed for the SSQ or the MISC. Significant differences at  $p < .0125$  are indicated with an \*.



**Fig. 2.** The sway path length (SPL; mm,  $\pm$ SEM) for all measurements, separate for viewing 2D (solid line) and 3D (dashed line). For both 2D and 3D, after all blocks of exposure (per-1, per-2, post) the SPL was significantly increased compared to pre-exposure. Significant differences at  $p < .05$  are indicated with \*. Significant differences at  $p < .001$  are indicated with \*\*\*.

components did not change significantly, neither in the 2D nor in the 3D session.


#### 4. Discussion

To our knowledge, this study is the first to compare the influence of viewing 2D and 3D motion stimuli on two potential adverse effects within one group of participants under otherwise equal conditions. Our main findings were that exposure to both 2D and 3D motion stimuli caused equal, but moderate increases in VIMS symptoms, as measured with the SSQ, and equally affected multiple postural sway characteristics.

Confirming previous reports, this study showed that exposure to 2D and 3D motion stimuli can elicit VIMS symptoms [2,4,12,25,26,34,35], as assessed using the SSQ (for both 2D and 3D). However, we did not find evidence supporting the results from earlier studies that viewing 3D causes more VIMS compared to viewing 2D [2,24–27]. Both the SSQ total scores and MISC rates failed to increase substantially more in the 3D session than scores obtained in the 2D session. Moreover, we did not observe significant differences between the 2D and 3D sessions on any of the SSQ subscales. This lack of difference in VIMS scores indicates, on the other hand, that stereoscopic 3D stimuli also does not significantly decrease VIMS symptoms compared to viewing 2D stimuli; which has been suggested in the press with the development of the Oculus Rift [36].

Although we observed significant increases in VIMS symptoms, in most cases the SSQ scores reflected minor symptoms, typically other than nausea, e.g. a-specific oculomotor or disorientation symptoms (SSQ). Since we did not observe a significantly higher oculomotor score in the 3D session as compared to the 2D session, we argue that the observed oculomotor symptoms were not solely caused by the accommodation–vergence conflict [37]; but, rather reflect VIMS symptoms caused by other visual factors present in both the 2D and 3D stimuli [1,37,38]. Moreover, the observed increase in disorienting symptoms, which are only part of the symptom set of VIMS, provides evidence in favor of VIMS over visual discomfort. Finally, the results on the SSQ are in line with





**Fig. 3.** The SD (SPL; mm,  $\pm$ SEM) in the (a) anteroposterior (AP) direction and (b) mediolateral (ML) direction for all moments, separate for viewing 2D (solid line) and 3D (dashed line). For both 2D and 3D and the AP and ML direction, the SD was significantly increased after all blocks of exposure (per-1, per-2, post) compared to pre-exposure. Borderline significant differences are indicated with †. Significant differences at  $p < .05$  are indicated with \*. Significant differences at  $p < .01$  are indicated with \*\*.

the only two other studies that investigated VIMS in relation to viewing 2D and 3D motion stimuli on a TV screen [25,26]. However, the severity of VIMS was very low compared to that observed in studies using (large) projection screens, as used in movie theaters [10,12,23,24].

The choice of the documentary in relation to the size of the TV-screen may explain the marginal increase in VIMS symptoms in our study. Since the documentary was originally designed to be displayed on cinema screens, it contains several geometrical distortions when shown on a smaller screen [39,40]. By displaying the documentary on a significantly smaller screen, the interaxial distance of the stereo camera was scaled down too. The down scaling caused geometrical distortions, since the viewer's pupil distance is fixed, i.e. does not scale down. In addition, by showing this documentary on a TV screen a large difference between the viewing angle subtended by the TV screen and the viewing angle captured by the camera was introduced (previously also referred to as external and internal fields of view) [10,23]. It has been shown that a large discrepancy between these viewing angles can reduce VIMS [10,23]. Summarized, both factors may have

**Table 1**

Simple contrasts following RM ANOVA's on postural sway measures.

Source	Df	F	p	$\eta_p^2$
<i>SPL</i>				
Per-1 vs. Pre*	1	5.86	.029	.28
Per-2 vs. Pre*	1	4.87	.043	.25
Post vs. Pre***	1	15.35	.001	.51
<i>SD AP</i>				
Per-1 vs. Pre*	1	4.61	.049	.24
Per-2 vs. Pre†	1	4.46	.052	.23
Post vs. Pre**	1	9.58	.007	.39
<i>SD ML</i>				
Per-1 vs. Pre*	1	7.01	.018	.32
Per-2 vs. Pre†	1	3.67	.075	.20
Post vs. Pre**	1	9.34	.008	.39
<i><math>\alpha_s</math>-AP</i>				
Per-1 vs. Pre**	1	11.84	.004	.44
Per-2 vs. Pre**	1	11.74	.004	.44
Post vs. Pre***	1	35.93	<.0001	.71
<i><math>\alpha_s</math>-ML main effect</i>				
Per-1 vs. Pre***	1	19.03	.001	.56
Per-2 vs. Pre**	1	11.90	.004	.44
Post vs. Pre***	1	16.94	.001	.53
<i><math>\alpha_s</math>-ML interaction effect</i>				
Per-1 vs. Pre & 3D vs. 2D*	1	6.46	.023	.30
Per-2 vs. Pre & 3D vs. 2D	1	1.37	.260	.08
Post vs. Pre & 3D vs. 2D**	1	12.56	.003	.46
Error	15			

†  $p < .08$ .

\*  $p < .05$ .


\*\*  $p < .01$ .

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

decreased the naturalness of the images to such an extent that the images were judged as somewhat unnatural, reducing VIMS. As proposed by Golding et al. and Gresty et al. [17,41], visual cues that are obviously incongruent to other (i.e. vestibular and expected) cues are set aside by the central nervous system, i.e. the visual cues are 'quarantined'. This quarantining of the visual cues thus suppressed the sensory conflict between the sensed and expected sensory cues, and led in the 3D condition to less VIMS than hypothesized.

Further research would help to obtain a better insight into which visual factors motivate the central nervous system to quarantine visual cues. Such an insight is not only valuable from a fundamental point of view, but also would serve a practical purpose. If visual factors are defined that stimulate quarantining, such factors can be incorporated (or left out) in visual motion stimuli to reduce (or increase) VIMS. As discussed above, we propose that at least two visual factors, present in the stimulus used in this study, may have caused quarantining: (1) geometrical distortions provoked by showing the documentary on a smaller screen compared to where it was designed for, and (2) the difference between the viewing angle captured by the camera and the viewing angle subtended by the TV screen [10,23]. However, future research – typically requiring visual motion stimuli specifically designed to optimize these discrepancies – is needed to define whether these, and possibly other factors, play a role in quarantining of the visual cues.

In this study participants only wore the polarized glasses in the 3D session, which could be a confounding factor. Read et al. [25], found that participants who thought they were watching 3D motion stimuli, but were actually viewing 2D stimuli through polarized or shutter-glasses, already reported more VIMS symptoms than participants who knew they were watching 2D. It was suggested that part of the increase in VIMS symptom severity



**Fig. 4.** Mean ( $\pm$  SEM) (a)  $\alpha_s$  in AP direction, (b)  $\alpha_s$  in ML direction, (c)  $\alpha_l$  in AP direction and (d)  $\alpha_l$  in ML direction for all measurement moments, separate for viewing 2D (solid line) and 3D (dashed line). The short-range scaling components in AP and ML direction ( $\alpha_s$ -AP and  $\alpha_s$ -ML) for both 2D and 3D viewing were significantly increased after all blocks of exposure (per-1, per-2, post) compared to pre-exposure. Significant differences at  $p < .01$  are indicated with an \*\*. Significant differences at  $p < .001$  are indicated with \*\*\*.

could be accounted for by these glasses and the conviction that viewing 3D causes adverse effects, and not by the 3D stereoscopic depth cues as such [25]. However, in this study we did not find a difference between VIMS symptoms caused by viewing 2D stimuli and 3D stimuli, excluding the possibility that the polarized glasses had a significant confounding influence on VIMS symptoms.

With regard to postural sway we expected that viewing 2D and 3D motion stimuli would cause a significant increase, and we tested whether 3D stimuli would cause more postural sway compared to 2D stimuli. Indeed we found significant increases in postural sway after viewing both 2D and 3D, but 3D stimuli did not cause more postural sway than 2D. The global postural sway characteristics showed that participants swayed more and further in both the fore–after and left–right directions after viewing 2D and 3D motion stimuli. Moreover, the structural characteristics showed that postural sway became more persistent on a short time scale (0.3–0.8 s) due to exposure to 2D and 3D motion stimuli. In other words, viewing 2D and 3D motion stimuli made it more likely that the CoP velocity continued with similar characteristics, i.e. with the same direction and speed, as it did in the (very recent) past.

Earlier studies reported similar increases on postural sway effects of 2D and 3D motion stimuli, however, in separate studies ([8–11,42] versus [12], respectively). With this study we were able

to compare postural sway caused by viewing 2D and 3D motion stimuli in one single study, and observed that exposure to 3D motion stimuli did not cause more postural sway compared to viewing 2D. This finding is in agreement with yet another recent study [33] in which similar increases in postural sway measures were observed induced by viewing still- and motion images. Together, these studies show that postural sway obtained with eyes closed can be affected by watching stimuli *per se*, and does not necessarily depend on the type of stimuli watched. This observation may be explained by so-called exploratory postural behavior of an endogenous nature [43–45], rather than an exogenously caused postural sway as can be observed while watching visual motion. An increased postural sway during exposure to the motion stimuli could thus allow the participant to gain more information about self-orientation with respect to the virtual environment [45].

In summary we conclude that we can be equally moved by and do not really get sick from viewing 2D and 3D motion stimuli designed for a cinema environment on a commonly available TV screen, in which case quarantining is at issue.

#### Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## Acknowledgements

Thanks to Jeroen Borst, BSc and Esther Bosboom, BSc for their assistance in data collection and data analyses. This study is part of the PhD project titled “Standing Well”, financed by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO; nr. 406-11-020) and the project Operation Oriented Simulation supported by the Dutch Ministry of Defense (V1427-WP4).

## References

- [1] R.S. Kennedy, J. Drexler, R.C. Kennedy, Research in visually induced motion sickness, *Appl. Ergon.* 41 (2010) 494–503, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2009.11.006>.
- [2] A.G. Solimini, Are there side effects to watching 3D movies? A prospective crossover observational study on visually induced motion sickness, *PLoS ONE* 8 (2013) e56160, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0056160>.
- [3] R.S. Kennedy, N.E. Lane, K.S. Berbaum, M.G. Lilienthal, Simulator sickness questionnaire: an enhanced method for quantifying simulator sickness, *Int. J. Aviat. Psychol.* 3 (1993) 203–220.
- [4] A.G. Solimini, A. Mannocci, D. Di Thiene, G. La Torre, A survey of visually induced symptoms and associated factors in spectators of three dimensional stereoscopic movies, *BMC Publ. Health* 12 (2012) 779, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-12-779>.
- [5] J.R. Lackner, Motion sickness: more than nausea and vomiting, *Exp. Brain Res.* 232 (2014) 2493–2510, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00221-014-4008-8>.
- [6] J.F. Golding, M.A. Gresty, Pathophysiology and treatment of motion sickness, *Curr. Opin. Neurol.* 28 (2015) 83–88, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WCO.0000000000000163>.
- [7] A.S. Pollock, B.R. Durward, P.J. Rowe, J.P. Paul, What is balance?, *Clin Rehab.* 14 (2000) 402–406, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/0269215500cr3420a>.
- [8] X. Dong, K. Yoshida, T.A. Stoffregen, Control of a virtual vehicle influences postural activity and motion sickness, *J. Exp. Psychol. Appl.* 17 (2011) 128–138, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024097>.
- [9] Y. Chen, X. Dong, F. Chen, Control of a virtual avatar influences postural activity and motion sickness, *Ecol. Psychol.* 24 (2012) 279–299, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10407413.2012.726181>.
- [10] M.L. van Emmerik, S.C. de Vries, J.E. Bos, Internal and external fields of view affect cybersickness, *Displays* 32 (2011) 169–174, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.displa.2010.11.003>.
- [11] S.J. Villard, M.B. Flanagan, G.M. Albanese, T.A. Stoffregen, Postural instability and motion sickness in a virtual moving room, *Hum. Factors J. Hum. Factors Ergon. Soc.* 50 (2008) 332–345, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1518/001872008X250728>.
- [12] J.E. Bos, W.D. Ledegang, A.J.A. Lubeck, J.F. Stins, Cinerama sickness and postural instability, *Ergonomics* 56 (2013) 1430–1436, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2013.817614>.
- [13] J.T. Reason, J.J. Brand, *Motion Sickness*, Academic Press, London, 1975.
- [14] C.M. Oman, A heuristic mathematical model for the dynamics of sensory conflict and motion sickness, *Acta Otolaryngol.* 392 (1982) 1–44.
- [15] J.E. Bos, W. Bles, E.L. Groen, A theory on visually induced motion sickness, *Displays* 29 (2008) 47–57, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.displa.2007.09.002>.
- [16] B. Keshavarz, B.E. Riecke, L.J. Hettinger, J.L. Campos, Vection and visually induced motion sickness: how are they related?, *Front Psychol.* 6 (2015) 1–11, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00472>.
- [17] J.F. Golding, S. Arun, E. Wortley, K. Wotton-Hamrioui, S. Cousins, M.A. Gresty, Off-vertical axis rotation of the visual field and nausea, *Aviat. Space Environ. Med.* 80 (2009) 516–521, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3357/ASEM.2433.2009>.
- [18] M. Urvoy, M. Barkowsky, P. Le Callet, How visual fatigue and discomfort impact 3D-TV quality of experience. A comprehensive review of technological, psychophysical, and psychological factors, *Ann. Des. Telecommun. Telecommun.* 68 (2013) 641–655, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12243-013-0394-3>.
- [19] P.A. Howarth, Potential hazards of viewing 3-D stereoscopic television, cinema and computer games: a review, *Ophthalmic Physiol. Opt.* 31 (2011) 111–122, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-1313.2011.00822.x>.
- [20] W.J. Tam, F. Speranza, S. Yano, K. Shimono, H. Ono, Stereoscopic 3D-TV: visual comfort, *IEEE Trans. Broadcast.* 57 (2011) 335–346, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TBC.2011.2125070>.
- [21] P.J.H. Seuntjens, I.E.J. Heynderickx, W.A. Ijsselstein, P.M.J. van den Avoort, J. Berentsen, I.J. Dalm, et al., Viewing experience and naturalness of 3D images, in: *Proc. SPIE*, 2005, pp. 43–49.
- [22] M. Pölönen, M. Salmimaa, V. Aaltonen, J. Häkkinen, J. Takatalo, Subjective measures of presence and discomfort in viewers of color-separation-based stereoscopic cinema, *J. Soc. Inf. Display* 17 (2009) 459–466, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1889/JSID17.5.459>.
- [23] J.E. Bos, S.C. de Vries, M.L. van Emmerik, E.L. Groen, The effect of internal and external fields of view on visually induced motion sickness, *Appl. Ergon.* 41 (2010) 516–521, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2009.11.007>.
- [24] B. Keshavarz, H. Hecht, Stereoscopic viewing enhances visually induced motion sickness but sound does not, *Presence Teleop. Virt. Environ.* 21 (2012) 213–228.
- [25] J.C.A. Read, I. Bohr, User experience while viewing stereoscopic 3D television, *Ergonomics* 57 (2014) 1140–1153, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2014.914581>.
- [26] S. Yang, T. Schlieski, B. Selmins, S.C. Cooper, R.A. Doherty, P.J. Corriveau, et al., Stereoscopic viewing and reported perceived immersion and symptoms, *Optom. Vis. Sci. Off. Publ. Am. Acad. Optom.* 89 (2012) 1068–1080, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/OPX.0b013e31825da430>.
- [27] H. Ujiike, H. Watanabe, Effects of stereoscopic presentation on visually induced motion sickness, in: A.J. Woods, N.S. Holliman, N.A. Dodgson (Eds.), *IS&T/SPIE Electron. Imaging*, 2011, pp. 786314–786320, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1117/12.873500>.
- [28] J.F. Golding, Motion sickness susceptibility questionnaire revised and its relationship to other forms of sickness, *Brain Res. Bull.* 47 (1998) 507–516.
- [29] J.E. Bos, S.N. MacKinnon, A. Patterson, Motion sickness symptoms in a ship motion simulator: effects of inside, outside, and no view, *Aviat. Space Environ. Med.* 76 (2005) 1111–1118.
- [30] D. Delignières, K. Torre, P.L. Bernard, Transition from persistent to anti-persistent correlations in postural sway indicates velocity-based control, *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 7 (2011) e1001089, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1001089>.
- [31] J.J. Collins, C.J. De Luca, Open-loop and closed-loop control of posture: a random-walk analysis of center-of-pressure trajectories, *Exp. Brain Res.* 95 (1993) 308–318, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8224055>.
- [32] C.K. Peng, S. Havlin, H.E. Stanley, A.L. Goldberger, Quantification of scaling exponents and crossover phenomena in nonstationary heartbeat time series, *Chaos: Interdiscip. J. Nonlinear Sci.* 5 (1995) 82–87.
- [33] A.J.A. Lubeck, J.E. Bos, J.F. Stins, Motion in images is essential to cause motion sickness symptoms, but not to increase postural sway, *Displays* 38 (2015) 55–61, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.displa.2015.03.001>.
- [34] S.A.A. Naqvi, N. Badruddin, A.S. Malik, W. Hazabbah, B. Abdullah, Does 3D produce more symptoms of visually induced motion sickness?, *Eng. Med. Biol. Soc. (EMBC), 2013 35th Annu. Int. Conf. IEEE.*, 2013, pp. 6405–6408.
- [35] C.-Y. Chen, M.-D. Ke, P.-J. Wu, C.-D. Kuo, B.-J. Pong, Y.-Y. Lai, The influence of polarized 3D display on autonomic nervous activities, *Displays* 35 (2014) 196–201, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.displa.2014.05.001>.
- [36] P. Rubin, The inside story of oculus rift and how virtual reality became reality, *Wired.com*, 2014.
- [37] M. Lambooi, W. Ijsselstein, M. Fortuin, I. Heynderickx, Visual discomfort and visual fatigue of stereoscopic displays: a review, *J. Imaging Sci. Technol.* 53 (2009) 030201, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2352/J.ImagingSci.Technol.2009.53.3.030201>.
- [38] C. Blehm, S. Vishnu, A. Khattak, S. Mitra, R.W. Yee, Computer vision syndrome: a review, *Surv. Ophthalmol.* 50 (2005) 253–262, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.survophthal.2005.02.008>.
- [39] A. Norkin, I. Girdzijauskas, 3DTV: One stream for different screens: keeping perceived scene proportions by adjusting camera parameters, in: *Pict. Coding Symp.*, 2012, pp. 489–492, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/PCS.2012.6213261>.
- [40] B.F. Zilly, J. Kluger, P. Kauff, Production rules for stereo Acquisition, in: *Proc. IEEE*, 2011, pp. 590–606.
- [41] M.A. Gresty, S. Waters, A. Bray, K. Bunday, J.F. Golding, Impairment of spatial cognitive function with preservation of verbal performance during spatial disorientation, *Curr. Biol.* 13 (2003) R829–R830, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2003.10.013>.
- [42] A. Murata, Effects of duration of immersion in a virtual reality environment on postural stability, *Int. J. Hum. Comput. Interact.* 17 (2004) 463–477, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327590ijhc1704\\_2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327590ijhc1704_2).
- [43] R.E.A. van Emmerik, E.E.H. van Wegen, On the functional aspects of variability in postural control, *Exerc. Sport Sci. Rev.* 30 (2002) 177–183, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00003677-200210000-00007>.
- [44] E.E.H. van Wegen, R.E.A. van Emmerik, G.E. Riccio, Postural orientation: age-related changes in variability and time-to-boundary, *Hum. Mov. Sci.* 21 (2002) 61–84, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0167-9457\(02\)00077-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0167-9457(02)00077-5).
- [45] G.E. Riccio, Information in movement variability. About the qualitative dynamics of posture and orientation, in: K.M. Newell, D.M. Corcos (Eds.), *Var. Mot. Control, Human Kinetics*, Champaign, IL, 1993, pp. 317–357.